

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended for further clarification. Claims 1-15 and 18-20 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the Interview conducted on December 27, 2005. Based upon the results of the interview, the independent claims have been amended to further clarify the patentable distinction of the present invention over the cited references.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-15 AND 18-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SREY ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,141,436; HEREINAFTER "SREY") (previously cited) IN VIEW OF BONGIORNO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,292,045; "BONGIORNO") (previously cited):

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known in the art to "encrypt and decrypt" data during transmission of the data by citing Teitelbaum (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,834). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Official Notice.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that Teitelbaum fails to make up for the deficiencies of the combination of Srey and Bongiorno. That is, neither Teitelbaum, Srey nor Bongiorno, individually or combined, disclose "a data conversion unit to encrypt data originating in the external device and return the encrypted originated data back to the same external device to be stored therein, and when decrypting the stored encrypted originated data, the stored encrypted originated data is transmitted from the same external device to the data conversion unit to be decrypted and then the decrypted data is returned back to the same external device to be read," as recited in amended claim 1, for example.

Instead, Fig. 6 of Tietelbaum discloses a telephone having a biometric sensing device. The telephone has a biometric input sensor means for receiving a biometric input whereby the telephone merely encrypts the biometric data input through the biometric input sensor and transmits the encrypted data to the server (below the dashed line). The telephone does not return the encrypted data to the biometric input sensor means. Further, the telephone decrypts encrypted data received from the server, but does not return the decrypted data to the server. In addition, the biometric input sensor means is not an external device of the telephone.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite features similar as that of amended claim 1. Thus, although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited references.

Thus, the combination of Srey in view of Bongiorno fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

II. CONCLUSION:


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/28/05

By: 
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501